

97 00114

OXCA-0013

19

7/26/93

Annual?

**1992 REPORT OF THE**

**VENTURA COUNTY**

**COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC VITALITY**

**TO THE**

**VENTURA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

MAY 6 1993

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

14 15 16  
17 18 19

20 21 22

23 24 25

## CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction .....	2
Mission Statement .....	4
Ventura County Business Opportunities and Advantages .....	5
Task Force Reports	
Attitudes .....	6
Permit Regulatory Process .....	11
Jobs and Housing .....	15
Air Quality/Rule 210 .....	27
Economic Development .....	30
Scorecard .....	32
California Council on Competitiveness/Council on Partnerships	35
The Future of the Council on Economic Vitality .....	36
Members of the 1992 Council on Economic Vitality .....	37



# COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC VITALITY

## INTRODUCTION

To paraphrase McLuhan, the process is the message. At the behest of the Board of Supervisors in early 1992, forty county leaders from both the public and private sectors came together to discuss issues affecting the economic vitality of Ventura County. The Board members took care to appoint only top level representatives of wide variety of endeavors. The high level of dialogue intended by the Board was supported by the personal involvement of the Supervisors, of the Chief Administrative Officer, and of several senior level department managers from the county government. Their involvement had a great deal to do with demonstrating commitment and assuring the successful deliberation of the Council on a wide variety of issues.

The Council initially defined its mission and then proceeded to identify five top priority issues for further discussion. Task Forces were formed, with all of the Council members and many others recruited from various parts of the community, to analyze and formulate recommendations on each of the five issues.

The Council met approximately twice a month for most of the year, with the majority of the time devoted to the work of the Task Forces. The reports and recommendations of those Task Forces, which make up the main section of this report, represent the organized agenda of the Council during 1992. Along the way, however, many smaller issues and opportunities presented themselves to the Council for its consideration and possible advocacy. And, the discussions of the Council inspired some of its members to initiate unilateral responses in their respective work places. The "Scorecard" which follows the reports of the Task Forces lists these numerous incidental issues and individual initiatives which comprise the unanticipated, but no less important, results of the Council's work.

It is clear that the progress of the Council in working to achieve greater economic vitality for Ventura County has occurred in numerous small steps, and that many of those steps occurred outside of, but as a result of, the Council's formal activity. The very process of convening the Council and causing it to pursue a constructive discussion of meaningful issues resulted in a greater sensitivity on the part of all concerned participants to ways in which they could individually contribute to economic vitality. At least in this early stage, therefore, the process has been at least as important as the specific recommendations contained in this report.



Early in the year, the Council sponsored the first annual Ventura County Economic Vitality Summit. Attended by 400 local leaders, this summit launched the concept of joint public and private responsibility for furthering the cause of economic vitality in the county. It is anticipated that future annual Economic Vitality Summits will report on the progress made toward greater vitality by each year's work of the Council and will assist future Councils in focusing their work.

Clearly, the need for attention to issues affecting economic vitality has not abated. There is a great deal of work to be done by the Council. This report should, therefore, be seen as an interim report of the early stages of a long-term process of cooperation between the public and private sectors to strengthen the economy of Ventura County.

As the Board of Supervisors and the members of the Council look forward to possible continuation of the Council's work, one major component of the effort to build a vital economy requires consideration. The responsibility for retaining businesses that currently operate in Ventura County and for attracting businesses to our County does not presently reside with any one group, agency or association. Parts of the job are done by various groups without the coordination that would enhance efficiency and effectiveness. The Council on Economic Vitality would appear to be well positioned to serve as a catalyst for the coordination of a countywide effort, involving the cities, to retain and attract business.

The current members of the Council urge the members of the Board of Supervisors to view their work during this past year as a beginning, to charge the Council with continuing its work in the coming year, and to encourage the members of the 1993 Council to build on the collaboration and the progress that has been made in the past year. The current members of the Council wish to acknowledge the foresight of the Board of Supervisors in forming the Council and to thank the Board for the opportunity to serve.

# COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC VITALITY

## MISSION STATEMENT

The Council on Economic Vitality is a partnership of the public and private sectors which will stimulate the Ventura County economy by:

1. Facilitating resolution of difficulties between the public and private sectors.
2. Encouraging constructive attitudes.
3. Advocating structural or regulatory changes of city, county, state and federal agencies.
4. Advocating entrepreneurial endeavors that involve both public and private sectors.
5. Identifying and promoting projects that are critical to a viable economy and balanced environment.



# COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC VITALITY VENTURA COUNTY BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES AND ADVANTAGES

## Regional Positioning

- Access to Pacific Rim markets
- Diverse internal marketplace
- Deep water port -- international access
- Easy migration for businesses relocating from Los Angeles basin
- Rail system in place
- Diverse technical/mechanical services available
- Sixty mile radius from Los Angeles basin
- Central Coast World Trade Center Association headquarters

## Labor Market

- Versatile, dependable labor supply
- Job training assistance by local colleges
- All skill levels represented

## Commercial/Industrial Space Availability

- 6.9 million square feet available
- Lease prices from \$0.16 to \$1.20 per square foot (gross basis)
- Purchase prices from \$23.60 to \$143.11 per square foot
- Vacancy rate of 16.8%
- Flexible real estate market

## Planned Regulatory Permitting Assistance

- Streamlined city/county governments
- Ombudsman service
- Assistance with Air Pollution Control District provided

## Quality of Life

- Mediterranean climate
- Proximity to natural resources
- Excellent infrastructure
- Low crime rate
- Better school systems
- Good transportation system
- Geographically, culturally and recreational diverse

# COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC VITALITY

## ATTITUDES TASK FORCE

MEMBERS: Dana Weber Young, Chairperson, Supervisor Maggie Kildee, Nancy Bender, Carolyn Leavens, Bill Little, Al Guilen, Walt Schaedle, Lance Winslow, Richard Wittenberg, David Smith, Mary Lindley

The Attitudes Task Force has had as its primary charter to improve the attitudes of government and business toward each other in Ventura County. In the process of inquiring into this issue, we have recognized the following as key factors influencing the phenomena of "attitudes":

#1. Attitude is a double edged sword. You can't change the attitude of government toward business unless you simultaneously change the attitude of business toward government. Both feed upon the other. For example, as long as business distrusts government, government will, in turn, distrust business. Who started it? Who knows. Who's right? -- the question becomes academic and will only evoke defensiveness and deepen the adversity.

#2. Government-business attitudes are invariably grounded in paradigms or well ingrained assumptions, often unquestioned, about the other party. These paradigms have a way of becoming self fulfilling. As with our "trust" example in the paragraph above, the best way to get someone to trust you is to begin by trusting them. The converse works as well. Many of these paradigms are long standing "truths". For example, it is not unusual to encounter business people who are "resigned" to the "fact" that government is and will always be bureaucratic, unresponsive and insensitive.

#3. Attitudes, especially those grounded in strong paradigms, are changed by changing people's actions -- not by "getting inside their heads". More specifically, if one's intention is to create an attitude of mutual trust you begin by creating common and mutual goals. Goals which, by definition, relate to specific and measurable outcomes. These goals, in turn, can generate specific joint actions. Changing attitudes by just talking about them or lecturing people about why they should respect others rarely pays off in the long haul although they might have a very short term impact.



#4. Lastly, one can reaffirm an old adage. That being, that to shift attitudes in an organization, business or government, you start at the top. Changing attitudes that are well ingrained requires strong leadership that is willing and committed to going "against the grain" if necessary. As many organizations have learned, for example, changing the behavior of customer service or counter people without a change at the top never works.

---

#### **Results of Government-Business Leader Workshops:**

The Attitudes Task Force has completed three half day facilitated workshops that have involved city managers in Ventura County and leaders of large and medium sized businesses in the county. The intention of the workshops was to create a process whereby the issue of "attitude" could be meaningfully and constructively addressed.

At the outset of each session, each group -- city managers and business leaders -- was asked to identify their paradigms about the other. We asked them, in effect, to "let it all hang out". The results could be best summarized as follows:

#### **Business leaders on city government:**

- Bureaucratic
- no sense of urgency
- don't understand profit
- inconsistent
- rule driven -- not results oriented
- capricious
- costs are outrageous
- small minorities influence decision making disproportionately
- city mission/power base can change quickly

#### **Government leaders on business:**

- profit at any cost
- try to avoid rules
- short term vision
- don't understand government
- don't get involved unless it's their issue
- feeling of superiority -- they're better than government
- not politically influential
- try to do minimum or less
- job providers
- lack of awareness/knowledge of environmental concerns



Rather than argue about who was right or wrong -- a process all recognized as futile -- the groups then were asked to jointly identify what "was possible" acknowledging, but not limited by, these paradigms.

This, in turn, evoked **common** possibilities -- which surprised many participants. These possibilities were then translated into six specific and measurable goals. An additional criterion for these goals was that they "require" a fundamental shift in the prevailing business-government and government-business attitude in the county.

- #1. Achieve full, quality employment in Ventura County, above the "mean income" for California.
- #2. Measurably increase productivity of business and government. Government makes a "profit".
- #3. Make Ventura County known as an area where county/city government is productive and works in partnership with business. New business is welcome.  
  
- a manifestation of this would be a significant reduction of and freedom from excessive and redundant rules and regulations.
- #4. Develop a world class education system in the county.
- #5. Become known as a county that empowers all segments of community for the betterment of all.
- #6. Establish criteria for the "quality of life" between government and business.

In order to ensure that the established process would not vanish and encourage the actual creation of a forum (recommendation #1), the participants in the attitudes workshops have requested that a sub-committee be formed.

This committee should have representatives from both the private sector and government. The City Managers have actually identified their representatives. The purpose of the committee would be to design the future process for meeting, identifying and bringing forward issues that should be resolved in a broader workshop setting.

The workshop attendees are determined to continue working on resolving paradigm inaccuracies and are anxious to continue their dialogue in 1993.

In summary, it was then concluded by the teams that by working together **as a partnership** toward realizing these common goals, the issue of attitude could be meaningfully addressed.



---

## Recommendations: Next Steps

In inquiring further into this, what was felt by all to be missing was an **ongoing process** that involved both government and business leaders in creating and measuring the quality of life (#6 above) in Ventura County. The issue of "quality of life" was felt to be fundamental to the current adversarial climate or attitude. Not until business and government leaders could reconcile this admittedly amorphous issue meaningfully through a mutual and sustained dialogue could we begin to address the other more specific goals/challenges noted above.

For example, the issue of redundant and excessive rules and regulations needs, it is felt, to be addressed within the context of a mutual consensus and understanding between business and government leaders regarding "quality of life". To discuss "rules and regulations" without bringing into it our different assumptions and points of view about the quality of life in Ventura County is to ignore the larger issues that both keep us apart and, potentially, might bring us together.

The participants recognized that the answer was, in effect, in the process. There are no simple answers. Currently this process is missing and in its absence both "sides" tended to polarize in their paradigms and attitudes about one another.

What was both surprising and encouraging to all participants in the workshops was that all parties could concur there is a problem and, that they could, working together, begin to meaningfully address it. The necessity of continuing this dialogue toward realizing the specific and mutual goals noted above, was strongly endorsed.

More specifically, the group recommends to the Council:

- #1. Create a forum wherein business and government leaders can meet regularly as a partnership to establish these quality of life criteria for Ventura County
- #2. Find models to emulate of business/government partnership
- #3. Acknowledge and make known successes
- #4. Bring the media into the process
- #5. Influence laws/regulations that come from other agencies -- eg. APCD -- and involve them if necessary in the process.

In summary, the "attitudes" Task Force is encouraged by the commitment and resourcefulness of all parties in tackling what to many can appear to be a difficult and intractable challenge. The Task Force wishes to thank and acknowledge all participants for their time and dedication.



# COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC VITALITY

## TASK FORCE ON PERMIT REGULATORY PROCESS

Issues, Statements and Recommendations

### STATE LEVEL

#### ISSUE:

It has been difficult, costly and time consuming for an applicant to obtain the necessary permits for property development in California in some instances, with questionable gain to the general public.

#### DESCRIPTION:

Various bodies of state law provide the framework and overall rules for land use planning, discretionary entitlement processing and permit issuance. These laws are intended to protect the health, safety and welfare of the general public, while affording individual property owners the ability to develop their property consistent with community goals, policies and values. As time has gone by, some of these laws have been amended through both the legislative and judicial process to the point where they conflict with one another, bear little relationship to the original intent of the legislation, and require the expenditure of time, effort and money, with little or no public benefit. This dilemma has been heightened by the prolonged economic downturn in California and is responsible for communities seeking meaningful solutions to permit processing problems.

### Recommendations:

The following recommendations are offered to the state as to how existing laws may be changed to assist local governments in their attempt to streamline and make more flexible the rules and procedures pertaining to development processing, while not sacrificing the public input or project improvement process:

#### PERMIT STREAMLINING ACT

- Allow by mutual consent greater time frames for complex application processing (would avoid the "denial" approach and the "withdraw and refile" approach, which may require more fees.)

- Require more standardized application packet with explanations of the permit process, names and phone numbers of key departments and contacts, or mandatory pre-submittal meetings to discuss such, prior to application submittal.

#### CEQA

- Limit by legislation the type and scope of litigation which can be filed in cause of action suits challenging the environmental review process (e.g., minor procedural glitch can defeat or significantly delay a project.) Local agencies are very fearful of courts finding an EIR inadequate, and will "overdo" process to ensure a good document. This may result in greater time and cost to the applicant.
- Expand list, at State level, of Categorical Exemptions in CEQA. This will allow local agencies to exempt more projects that are of minor consequence from the environmental review process, saving 30-45 days in the process.
- Limit the environmental review process to project-specific impacts on projects which are consistent with an adequate General Plan and zoning. Currently considerable discussion in an EIR must be devoted to cumulative impacts, alternatives, etc. This can be reduced (therefore the cost) for projects found to be consistent with a well prepared General Plan.
- Allow by mutual consent a longer extension than 15 days beyond the initial 30-day period for determining the appropriate type of environmental document. This could eliminate the existing practice of jurisdictions of calling for an EIR, when information is not provided in a timely manner, then downgrading to less of a process once further information is received.

#### GOVERNMENT CODE - PLANNING AND ZONING LAWS

- Require that all jurisdictions develop a list of those uses which are allowed by right (ministerial, if all standards are met) in each zoning district. Many currently discretionary projects, with the application of certain standards, could be made ministerial, achieving the same result at less cost and time.



---

## LOCAL LEVEL

### ISSUE:

Permit processing requirements are often very complex, time consuming and costly for the applicant. Each municipality has their own individual set of land use regulations and administrative permit processing policies. The situation is compounded by the need for the applicant to comply with stringent air quality regulations. In addition, many applicants have very specific needs, such as the oil industry, that may require unique consideration by a number of agencies. Extensive public input is required at nearly every stage of permit review, often resulting in significant delays and project uncertainty for all parties involved. While public input is vital to project review, more opportunities, in some cases, exist than are necessary to ensure meaningful citizen participation.

### DESCRIPTION:

Significant improvements to the permit process in each municipality can be attained if the entire issue is addressed comprehensively. In other words, all facets of the process from pre-application meetings, on through to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, must be reviewed. At each step or level, strides can be taken to improve communications, reduce unnecessary procedures, and coordinate key tasks within that organization, as well as between other agencies and jurisdictions.

### Recommendations:

The recommendations that follow include actions for both individual jurisdictions, as well as joint efforts between cities and counties:

- Pre-submittal process -- for many applicants, obtaining a permit within a jurisdiction is a one-time occurrence. They are afforded little opportunity to become experienced and knowledgeable in obtaining permits. A well thought out pre-application submittal meeting or document would go a long way toward educating the potential applicants as to what will be expected, how long the process will take, and how much it may cost. Of course, the more consistent these pre-submittal processes are among the jurisdictions, the better.

- Review permit requirements to see if decision making authority may be reduced, e.g., can a decision now made by the Planning Commission be made by the Planning Director, without sacrificing quality or needed process.
- Review permit requirements to see if discretionary permits may be made ministerial with the application of certain standards.
- Cities and County should strive to create environmental and permit procedures as consistent with one another's as possible.
- Cities should develop standard methodologies for filling out initial studies. County has recently produced draft Initial Study Guidelines in an effort to "de-mystify" the process and ensure consistency of application standards among projects.
- County will cooperate with cities by making the rather complete, Unified Mapping System and other data bases, available to cities. This information may prove useful in avoiding duplication for projects that are proposed on the edge of cities.
- Cities and County should develop a standard feedback form, surveying applicants who have recently completed the discretionary permit process, to solicit improvements to the system.
- Cities and County should develop standard "public brochures" which explain in "lay" language, how to obtain the various permits for uses and structures.



# COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC VITALITY

## TASK FORCE ON JOBS AND HOUSING

### Affordable Housing: A Vital Element for A Healthy County Economy

Ventura County's enviable past record of sustained economic growth is in danger. Businesses, already pressed by the economic slowdown, are fleeing the county to escape soaring worker's compensation costs, high taxes, and high housing costs.

High housing costs for employees can translate into bottom-line problems for employers. Long commutes to the worksite from distant, but affordable housing erodes worker productivity through lateness, absenteeism, and "road stress." The ability to recruit and retain employees is also affected. Job offers are turned down when candidates fear the high price of houses in the area will prevent them from purchasing a home.

*Employer-Assisted Housing Programs, 1991*  
Hewitt Associates

According to a 1991 National Association of Home-builders Survey, Ventura County ranks in the top five least affordable housing markets in the U.S. In order to stem the flow of businesses from our communities and to compete effectively with other counties for new businesses, the county must address the issue of affordable housing.

The county's population increased 26.4% between 1980 and 1990. During those boom years, it seemed that the main goal of local government was to regulate growth and fiercely protect the area's much-vaunted quality of life. That scenario has changed. Well-intentioned but poorly planned no-growth regulations, cumbersome building codes, excessive fees, lengthy approval processes, and antiquated zoning practices have artificially and unnecessarily raised area housing costs, putting home ownership out of reach for most of the county's residents and drowning innovative development in a sea of bureaucratic red tape.

In addition to poisoning the business climate of the area, the lack of affordable housing presents a host of serious problems for local communities. Homelessness and crime are exacerbated, and people are often forced to live 10 or 12 to a house, in violation of zoning ordinances, because they cannot find affordable housing. Workers are forced to commute from areas where cheaper housing is available, adversely affecting road traffic and air quality. And such valuable community members as school teachers, police officers, and firefighters simply cannot afford to live in the communities they serve.

Finally, the State of California has mandated that cities must take steps to provide affordable housing. If communities fail to act, they face a possible loss of local control.

---

## Underlying Causes

What is the root cause of this housing crisis? Ventura County continues to be an extremely desirable place to live, and market forces will keep housing prices high relative to the rest of the country. But excessive and, in some cases, arbitrary fees and permitting procedures regulating the construction of new housing add tens of thousands of dollars to the cost of an already expensive new home. Restrictive zoning practices and subdivision ordinances aimed at protecting property values practically eliminate the possibility of constructing affordable housing.

The acronym used to describe the attitudes that underlie these practices is NIMBY: "not in my backyard." Many residents mistakenly believe that affordable housing inevitably brings with it lowered property values and urban problems such as overcrowding and crime. To the contrary, a well planned and executed affordable housing program will enhance the economic and civic vitality of the county, protecting it against the social and environmental ills associated with decaying urban areas.

**A survey of relevant research finds that 14 out of 15 studies "reached the conclusion that there are no significant negative effects from locating subsidized, special-purpose or manufactured housing near market-rate developments. Some, in fact, reported positive property value effects after locating subsidized units in the neighborhood."**

*Not In My Back Yard: Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing  
Advisory Commission on Regulatory Barriers to  
Affordable Housing, 1991*

---

## NIMBY Attitudes

Because local homeowners sit on boards and commissions, attend public hearings, and elect local government officials, NIMBY attitudes pervade local government regulatory and planning commissions. The concerns of current homeowners are represented almost to the exclusion of potential homeowners or prospective residents. To garner public support and political will for affordable housing, a broad-based coalition needs to be formed composed of those groups who will benefit. Developers, businesses, unions, minority leaders, young families, people on fixed incomes - a broad cross section of the local population needs to have its voice heard on planning commissions and at public hearings.



Another major part of the problem is the fragmented structure of government land-use and development regulation. Not only do many local jurisdictions control land uses and development within each metropolitan area, but multiple levels of government, and a multiplicity of agencies at each level, also have responsibility for one aspect or another of this process. Duplication, uneven standards, and other cost-producing consequences result from this regulatory system.

*Not In My Back Yard: Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing  
Advisory Commission on Regulatory Barriers  
to Affordable Housing, 1991*

---

## Land Use Policy

Obviously, while land prices of \$200,000 per acre are a major obstacle to affordable housing, increased densities and mixed zoning concepts can greatly lower the cost per buildable lot. If affordable housing is to be a priority, land must be found that can be zoned residential, and at higher densities. Higher density not only keeps land costs to a reasonable percentage of the housing cost, it also reduces infrastructure costs per capita and allows for more efficient use of residential land.

Mixed-use zoning is another good way to reduce land costs as a percentage of housing costs. The General Plan needs more flexibility to allow for mixed use in business park areas, allowing commercial tenants to share development costs. This mixed-use zoning, if properly planned, can confer additional benefits - allowing workers to live within walking distance of potential jobs, goods and services, and developing a strong sense of community among residents and businesses.

In one Santa Monica development, retail spaces are located at street level with offices and residential units on the floors above. This design strategy allows a commercial area to be occupied twenty-four hours a day, a technique that reduces the crime committed after commercial centers shut down in the evening and are evacuated until 8:00 a.m. the next day. It also locates residents of the third floor dwellings close to places of current or potential employment.

*The Housing Crisis: A Roof for All Residents  
The Conejo Future Foundation, June 1992*



---

## Fees and Regulations

Since the passage of Proposition 13, local government has financed much of its infrastructure and services for its citizens through the use of fees and exactions imposed on new projects.

*California's Jobs and Future  
Council on California Competitiveness, April 23, 1992*

State and local budget crises have forced the funding of infrastructure costs onto developers, and, ultimately, onto new homebuyers, forcing them in many cases to bear an inequitable share of the burden of capital improvements to the community.

Impact fees have been leveled by too many agencies for too many purposes. The multitude of agencies and jurisdictions involved increases administration costs and the time involved for assessment and collection. We need to develop county-wide standards for impact fees and limit those fees to 10% of the project cost.

In Ventura County, fees range from \$15,000 to \$25,000 per home, and in some cases exceed \$30,000.

**Impact fees are regressive because they are assessed on a per-unit basis, rather than a percent of the value of the home. Those who depend on affordable housing are forced to absorb fees that are a substantial percentage of the sales price of any home they purchase.**

*Not In My Back Yard: Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing  
Advisory Commission on Regulatory Barriers  
to Affordable Housing, 1991*

The fee collection apparatus must be streamlined. Delays caused by fees and permitting force developers to fall behind schedule and exceed their budgets and these increased costs are passed on to homebuyers and renters. If a project is in conformance with the General Plan, there is no reason that approval should take longer than 18 months.

Environmental impact fees and regulations also drive up the cost of housing. Regulations are often confusing and contradictory, and fees are not consistent throughout the county. Environmental concerns need to be weighed against the human concerns of affordable housing, and the process of obtaining environmental impact reports needs to be streamlined. Peter Ueberroth's "Council on California Competitiveness" recommends that counties require a Master Environmental Impact Report on their General Plan, and that they use the General Plan as the primary vehicle for environmental assessment.

For the county to take an active role in promoting affordable housing, we must institute a plan for the deferral or reduction of fees for developers who include affordable housing in their projects. The use of assessment/improvement districts and tax exempt revenue bonds should be explored to provide long-term financing at low interest rates for improvements now being included in the initial price of new homes.

**Strengthen existing statutes to provide that payment of development fees not be required until the date of actual fiscal impact on the locality, typically the date of the final inspection.**

*California's Jobs and Future  
Council on California Competitiveness, April 23, 1992*

---

## **Financing**

Creative solutions need to be explored, requiring the participation and cooperation of local government, lending institutions, and businesses. We should examine the models of the Coastal Housing Partnership in Santa Barbara, a consortium of 15 public and private employers committed to providing affordable housing to their employees. In cooperation with a local bank, the consortium provides financial assistance programs, purchases blocks of affordable housing units, and purchases and rehabilitates existing units. Employers should consider shared equity and interest rate "buydown" plans, and local governments should explore tax-exempt bond financing. In addition, communities should be encouraged to use redevelopment funds for first-time buyers financing.

---

## **Rehabilitation and Infill**

The rehabilitation of existing structures often meets with less NIMBY opposition because it raises property values and revitalizes run-down neighborhoods. Unfortunately, the high initial cost and relative scarcity of such structures in the county weigh against this option as a complete solution to the county's affordable housing woes. A separate but related topic is the value of accessory housing, so called granny flats. These can provide many units of affordable housing very cost-effectively and reduce the burden of mortgage payment on homeowners. Although this may attract strong opposition from neighborhoods and homeowners associations, research shows that such apartments, when carefully regulated, have little if any impact on property values.



As with a great many NIMBY notions that turn out to be incorrect, recent research suggests that neither quality of life nor property values suffer from the presence of accessory housing.

*Not In My Back Yard: Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing*  
Advisory Commission on Regulatory Barriers  
to Affordable Housing, 1991

---

## New Construction

The NIMBY syndrome often manifests itself in urban areas in the form of prohibitions against types of housing that are "different." Examples include factory-built homes—that is, manufactured and modular housing—and accessory housing. These products are widely recognized as important components of a complete affordable housing strategy.

*Not In My Back Yard: Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing*  
Advisory Commission on Regulatory Barriers  
to Affordable Housing, 1991

Construction and amenity standards suitable for affordable housing must be developed. Subdivision ordinances requiring dishwashers, landscaping, carpeting, two or three car garages, excessively wide streets, or square footage requirements, need to be amended to accommodate realistic expectations for affordable homes. Modular and pre-manufactured housing should be examined, and programs which allow people to invest sweat equity should be supported.

---

## The General Plan as an Instrument for Reform

This Task Force endorses the opinion of the California Council on Competitiveness that a well-crafted General Plan and specific plans are the most powerful tools for streamlining the bureaucracy associated with new home development. The plan must place a high priority on affordable housing for the continued economic well-being of the county. Projects that conform to the General Plan should be covered by a Master Environmental Impact Report, and should be ensured of fast-track approval. In addition, the General Plan should provide for capital improvements, including schools, allowing for an equitable sharing of costs between new and existing residents.



---

## Implementation and Accountability

This Task Force strongly recommends the creation of a formal, sanctioned Housing Commission. The commission should be comprised of county and city representatives, and include representation from the private sector, the community, and other appropriate public organizations. It must be a governmental commission with authority equal to that of the Waste Management Commission or the Transportation Commission.

The mandate of the Housing Commission should be to encourage individual communities to implement their own programs for providing affordable housing. This commission should monitor the preparation of each city's plan to provide affordable housing as well as their annual progress toward meeting their plans. We recommend plans include a preponderance of fee simple, single family dwellings that carry a minimum of restrictions relating only to the purchaser's income and occupancy term. The commission should also monitor the review and permitting process, work to develop and promote consistent, countywide standards, and possess the authority to require performance from local communities. In addition, the commission should actively represent Ventura County to the state legislature on housing issues.

Certain recommendations contained in this report may be unpopular with some special interest groups, but the problems associated with the lack of affordable housing and its economic impact on the county require immediate action. This issue is so vital to the future of Ventura County that its early implementation could easily serve as the impetus that lifts the county out of the current economic doldrums well ahead of the rest of the state.

## Jobs:

### BUSINESS RETENTION AND RECRUITMENT: A PROGRAM FOR SAVING JOBS

"Business activity appears to be gradually improving in most of the United States, but conditions continue to deteriorate in California because of mounting layoffs, declining construction and increasing pessimism, the Federal Reserve Board reported yesterday...Pessimistic sentiment in California is accelerating to such an extent that more than 80% of the businesses interviewed said they now doubt that the economy will grow even at modest rates over the year."

*L.A. Times, September 24, 1992*

There is no doubt that the California economy is beset by its own unique set of problems. The cuts in defense spending, changes in the world market, and huge budget deficits have hit California especially hard. The recession is putting the squeeze on businesses large and small alike, forcing them to reevaluate conditions that were tolerable during periods of economic growth. Festering problems like worker's compensation and the cost of health care threaten the health of all businesses. In addition, intensive recruiting efforts by other states and foreign countries have lured many businesses away from the state. In our own county, many jobs have been lost and commercial real estate vacancies are running at 20%.

The impact of job loss on the county's economy is difficult to overestimate. The county is losing high-tech, high paying jobs, and most new jobs are being created in the low-paying service sector. The loss of a high paying job sends a shock wave through the entire economy because that person no longer purchases the same number of goods and services. It has been estimated that for every mid-level management job eliminated, at least 8 other jobs are also lost.

As the recession deepens and as the ratio of taxpayers to those receiving money from state coffers continues to decrease, pressures will increase to adopt a more favorable stance toward business. Ventura County must be at the forefront of such efforts. Only by acting now can the county emerge from the recession in a strong position. Only by protecting and enhancing its business base can the county protect the jobs of its residents, and the tax base to provide the necessary services to those residents.

## WHY ARE BUSINESSES LEAVING CALIFORNIA?

The list is long, and many of the factors are impossible for the county to control. The most often cited problem is the state's abysmal worker's compensation system, one of the most expensive and least effective in the nation. The high cost of health care, excessive regulation, the cost of employee fringe benefits, and lack of affordable housing continue the list. When asked why Hughes Aircraft was relocating 4,500 jobs to Arizona, Vice Chairman Michael Smith, replied that Arizona offered cheaper housing, lower utility rates, lower labor costs, more favorable workers' compensation and lower business taxes. Add to this California's high product liability insurance, a Byzantine system of fees, permits and licenses, and extensive environmental regulations, and the resulting climate is distinctly hostile to business.

Business executives are pessimistic about the ability of government to help the situation. The perception of state government as hopelessly inept was reinforced by the recent budget crisis. Local government is viewed as being actively hostile to business. These conditions complicate any plan to retain and recruit business for the county.

**"They (municipal governments) all seem to want to be bedroom communities with office buildings and service jobs. They don't understand what our place is in a local economy. When we left, the city ... was pleased."**

*Plumbing manufacturer quote in Business Climate in Southern California, published by Southern California Edison*

There has, however, been a substantial turnaround in public opinion regarding new business growth in Ventura County. In a recent survey conducted by Ventura County National Bank, 83% of the respondents said that the county should actively encourage businesses to relocate here from other areas. Most respondents said the effort should concentrate on manufacturing and other high-paying industries.

## WHAT CAN BE DONE

There needs to be a two-part approach to solving the county's job crisis. **FIRST**, the adversarial relationship between business and various units of local government needs to be transformed. Communities need to recognize the contribution of business and balance those contributions against the environmental and quality of life issues that tend to dominate local governing bodies. The most urgent manifestation of this new relationship is the streamlining of the business fee and permitting system. The creation of a Business Ombudsman is a good first step in this direction.



**SECONDLY**, the county and the cities need to formulate a long range plan to attract growth industries that capitalize on the county's natural strengths, and to improve the county's infrastructure to be ready for those businesses. Port Hueneme is a good example of an area of concentration for infrastructure development, as it offers the county a vital link to other Pacific Rim nations and an important advantage in attracting new businesses to the area.

#### **RETAIN THE EXISTING BUSINESS BASE**

A special effort must be made to identify firms that are considering leaving the area or downsizing and to determine what specific factors are forcing them out. County and local government should search for creative incentives to keep firms that are considering leaving.

#### **RECRUIT NEW BUSINESS**

One major reason for the flight of business has been aggressive business recruitment campaigns by neighboring states. All of the negative media coverage of California's bad business climate has fueled a self-perpetuating trend of businesses leaving to search for greener pastures. The county has many strong advantages for businesses, including access to the large Southern California market, access to the Pacific Rim and world markets through Port Hueneme, excellent climate, low crime, and a skilled labor force.

Although in the past, new businesses have come knocking on our door, the county now needs to actively pursue businesses currently located in other states and in other parts of California. Several communities and organizations within the county have launched their own campaigns to attract new business. The county should encourage and coordinate such efforts.

#### **FORWARD-LOOKING SOLUTIONS**

California's economy is undergoing major changes, and a lack of planning on local and state levels has made the transition to a peacetime economy a painful one. Ventura County has the opportunity to emerge from this recession in a strong position to pursue long-range goals. The pending North American Free Trade Act will certainly have an additional destabilizing effect on the economy, and will result in big winners and losers. With adequate planning, Ventura County is in a position to be one of the big winners.

Recent events in Europe and Japan have brought home the fact that we are dealing with a world economy, and NAFTA will tighten our links with Canada and Mexico. Port Hueneme gives the county the opportunity to be a player in world trade with its desirable position on the Pacific Rim. Every effort should be made to expand the activities of the port and to publicize its existence to prospective businesses. Increased trade can provide a wide range of jobs, from blue collar to high-level management.

### EDUCATION

One important barrier to new business opportunities is the skilled labor force. To attract dynamic, high-paying companies and preserve the county's high per capita income, a well-educated work force is mandatory. The only viable solution to this problem is extensive investment in the educational resources of the county, which will ensure that our labor force is highly skilled, and therefore worth a premium wage. A highly skilled work force serves as an inducement to low environmental impacts, high-wage industries such as bio-technology and communications. Meanwhile, investment in education will provide retraining opportunities for the many residents who are out of work. Businesses should continue their involvement in technical training programs and efforts to attract more sources of higher education should be expedited.

### PURSUE FEDERAL MONEY

California ranks 23rd among states in per capita distribution of federal funds. The county should consider forming a task force to pursue federal redevelopment funds, and help support efforts such as the City of Oxnard's application for an Enterprise Zone. The county also needs to launch an effort to inform local businesses about opportunities to bid on federal and state contracts, and teach them how to effectively compete for such contracts. Cities within Ventura County also need to be ready and able to issue commercial development bonds in every way their individual charters will allow.

### BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES

Ventura County industry will best compete in those economic sectors that require hi-tech expertise and skill such as software, bio-technology, telecommunications, computers or engineering. Job re-training programs to prepare workers will be needed.

Specific business opportunities include Enterprise Zones, recycling technology, bio-engineering in agriculture, expanded utilization of Port Hueneme, telecommunications equipment, mass transit and private electric vehicles. Sources for additional information



include the California Council on Science and Technology, CALSTART (electric car consortium), Spectra Enterprise Associates, SCORE, the Simi Valley Job Club, and the various technology companies already represented in the county.

## Recommendations for Action:

- Launch a Business Retention program to contact firms who are considering leaving the county.
- Coordinate and support local efforts to attract business.
- Promote cooperation between businesses and local governments, focusing on expanding existing business opportunities.
- Assist business in obtaining state and federal contracts.
- Develop a portfolio of tax incentives, commercial development bonds, and grant programs to entice businesses into Ventura County.
- Provide relief for businesses from excessive regulatory burdens and promote an environment where businesses can achieve a profitable status.
- Aggressively pursue a low-income housing program to both encourage businesses to relocate their workforce to Ventura County and benefit our existing population.
- Develop a tracking and follow-up system for state legislation that impacts the business climate.
- Study the probable effects of the North American Free Trade Agreement and develop a plan to exploit Port Hueneme as a tool to expand employment and enhance economic growth in the region.

We are therefore recommending that the Ventura County Board of Supervisors establish an Economic Expansion Commission to coordinate and support individual city and private efforts to attract and retain businesses within Ventura County. It should address all action areas listed above as well as the large number of individual projects currently active within Ventura County.

# **COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC VITALITY**

## **TASK FORCE ON AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT**

### **RULE 210**

#### **BACKGROUND**

Both California and Federal laws require Air Pollution Control Districts (APCD) to implement vehicle trip reductions between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m., Monday through Friday. Federal law states such programs will be "employer based." Ventura County APCD's response is Rule 210, an 8 page detailed program intended to achieve average vehicle ridership (AVR) of 1.35 during the indicated hours.

#### **EMPLOYERS OBJECTIONS OF RULE 210**

Most employers object to the present form of Rule 210. Primary objections include:

The rule provides employers no authority to achieve the intent. Consequently, many employers have felt compelled to provide costly incentives to employees to achieve the intent.

Rule 210 is plan oriented versus goal oriented.

Rule 210 is overly bureaucratic, most employers would prefer APCD enforcement against goals rather than regulations regarding plan development.

Rule 210 is very invasive of the employer/employee relationship.

#### **CHANGES EMPLOYERS WOULD LIKE TO SEE**

Employers would like the option to be in a "performance mode" or a "plan mode." If employers can achieve the intent of the law on their own, they would like to avoid being compelled to draft a plan.

Employers would like the rule to be rewritten requiring employee accountability along with employer accountability to achieve the objective. Employers do not want to be required to provide incentives for employees to demonstrate required behavior.

Most employers would like the rule to be enforcement based rather than regulatory based: similar to a speed limit and citation for exceeding the limit. Employers would like similar treatment of employers and employees with respect to meeting ridership requirements.



## MILESTONES IN WORKING THE ISSUE

Between May and October, the committee on Air Quality met several times to discuss rule formulation change. Included were sessions with representatives of California Air Resources Board and Federal Environmental Project Agency, and meetings with business people. In an October 1 session facilitated by Abe Scher of the Pacific Mediation Center, the committee met with two Supervisors (Howard and Lacey), APCD representatives (Baldwin and Berg) and VCEDA representative, Mark Charney. In this four hour session, options for rule revision were fully explored and it was from this session that the final recommendations were developed.

## LIMITATIONS/REMAINING ISSUES

The recommendations are a compromise. Employers would have liked to have gotten greater employee accountability in the rule. On the other hand, government officials believe State and Federal law preclude going further than indicated in the recommendations.

## CONCLUSION

The recommendation is a significant improvement to Rule 210. Much flexibility was demonstrated by both business and government representatives in achieving it. It provides the basis for important and significant re-drafting of the law.

## Recommendations:

1. State rule in very clear and concise goal oriented form, in a manner which is suitable for work place posting and which enlists employee cooperation:

"Covered employers shall achieve an average vehicle ridership for all employees arriving or departing a covered work place between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. during Monday to Friday, inclusive, of any week, of 1.5 persons per vehicle, by such measures as car pooling, use of mass transit, walking, use of non-motorized vehicles, use of alternate fuel vehicles, telecommuting, flexible shifts, or other appropriate means."

Include other necessary information (provisions regarding definitions of terms, required record keeping, monitoring methods, AVR calculation method, etc) as an attachment.

2. Place employers in a "Performance Based" mode for the first year. Leave details of compliance to employers. Performance will be monitored by APCD. Those that achieve AVR go into a monitoring mode henceforth. Those who fail to achieve mandated AVR by specified deadline, must prepare plans pursuant to some version of current regulations, in addition to facing consequences of not achieving mandated AVR. If an employer so chooses, they could go immediately to a plan based mode initially.
3. Make penalties for noncompliance more reasonable and graduated, beginning at about \$500 and make penalties for noncompliance more explicit.
4. For Performance Based options, continue to make available APCD expertise for advice and counsel about trip reduction methods, as requested by employers.
5. For plan based options, develop standard plan provisions for monitoring and reporting.
6. Create a one-page Executive Summary concisely and clearly outlining the Rule. This summary would be suitable for posting at work sites for information/education of all affected employer personnel.
7. Recommend and support the Board of Supervisors work with Congressional and State representatives to redraft law and regulatory compliance language to encourage cooperation in achieving the intent of the law.



# COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC VITALITY

## TASK FORCE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Ventura County can no longer afford to take its economic vitality for granted. A coordinated effort of economic development, involving both the public and private sectors, is now urgently needed.

The economy of Ventura County, prior to World War II, was relatively insulated from neighboring areas. The population boom of the past half century has steadily decreased that insulation and tied our area to the Southern California economy. We now share the economic experience of the larger area, in good times and bad.

The balance of economic power in Ventura County has shifted from those who grew up here to those who have moved here, and to those who may move here in the future. Like an aging ingenue who has not yet conceded the need for makeup, our vitality depends on making ourselves attractive as a place to live and do business, to those who have already demonstrated a willingness to relocate.

The competition for businesses is at least national in scope and is increasingly sophisticated. It begins with the romance - high level solicitation and inducements - and continues throughout the marriage - attentiveness and responsive service.

Ventura County is competing only sporadically and its reputation is poor. We can improve, though, if we are willing to make a coordinated effort to do so. Many of the elements of such an effort are addressed by other task forces in this report - attitudes, permit processes, housing and jobs, and air quality regulation. As a summation of those issues and as a call for a comprehensive economic development effort, we offer the following Resolution for the consideration of the Board of Supervisors:

Whereas economic development is crucial to the quality of life in Ventura County, and requires support from both the public and private sectors;

Whereas an effective economic development program must address business retention, business development, job development, and attraction of tourism;

Whereas the Ventura County Economic Development Association and the City Chambers of Commerce are respected organizations providing an established structure for private sector activities in economic development;

Whereas the participation of county and city staff in the efforts of private sector associations has been awkward and needs to be accommodated through some more neutral forum;

Whereas a long-term commitment by the public and private sectors to stimulate Ventura County's economy is evidenced by the formation of the Council on Economic Vitality; and

Whereas the Council on Economic Vitality has adopted a mission which specifically includes advocacy of improvements to enhance the economic vitality of the county and promotion of business endeavors and projects in the county;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Board of Supervisors charges the Council on Economic Vitality together with the cities, Chambers, and VCEDA, to develop an actionable proposal for a coordinated, countywide, Economic Development Program, including specific recommendations as to funding and staffing; and

Be it further resolved that the Council form a coalition of business, labor, government, education, and non-profit leaders, for the purpose of retaining and attracting businesses which can create jobs in Ventura County; and

Be it further resolved that the Council should continue to focus its attention on attitudes and regulations and permit processes, in order to promote a positive business climate in Ventura County and to minimize confusion as to the costs of doing business in Ventura County; and

Be it further resolved that the Council should draw on the existing resources of county and city business associations, as appropriate, to participate in the ongoing campaign for economic development in Ventura County.



# COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC VITALITY

## SCORECARD

Endorsed by the Council to the Board of Supervisors, Proposition 90 Ordinance was adopted by the Board in March 1992. Prop 90 allows homeowners over the age of 55 to transfer the assessed value of the home they are selling, to the home they are buying, if the home they are buying is in another county.

Ventura County Council on Economic Vitality Summit held May 18, 1992. Keynote Speaker was Peter Ueberroth. Over 400 in attendance at the Lake Sherwood event.

The County's Resource Management Agency initiated a customer questionnaire "How are We Doing," to encourage feedback on the quality of service. "Exit Poll" questionnaires mailed to applicants at the conclusion of the permit process, to evaluate the service. Building and Safety, Environmental Health, Air Pollution Control District and Planning are also participating.

Resource Management Agency developed "Summary" lists of requirements for permits and entitlements, to be made available at city/county public service counters.

County Resource Management Agency institutes "Attitude and Customer Service" training programs.

APCD holds seminars on "Excellent Customer Service - Meeting or Exceeding Client Expectations."

County Management Association schedules conferences on "Managing with Less in Times of Greater Demand" and "Handling People with Tact and Skill."

County Personnel Department conducts classes for "Providing Exceptional Customer Service."

County Building and Safety institutes a public counter program with a numeric "next please" system, and a public "waiting room". Also a "Fast Track" process for small projects. Program implemented in contract cities.

June 24, 1992, the California Integrated Waste Management Board designated a Recycling Market Development Zone in Ventura County. The zones are intended to foster the development of businesses engaged in the manufacturing of recycled materials. The Economic Development Task Force reviews possible "incubator" programs for the zones.

The Council sent letters to our State Senators and Assembly representatives expressing concern with the lack of action on reforming Workers Compensation laws. Identified "problem areas" of insurance costs, medical treatment costs, stress claims, fraud and abuse, litigation costs, and vocational rehabilitation costs. The letter requested priority be established for these issues.

The Council endorses a request to the Board of Supervisors to establish an Ombudsman position in the County. Approved by the Board in August, the Ombudsman will work with the business community and county agencies to streamline regulatory-permit process and inter-agency coordination.

APCD/Weights & Measures agreed to joint inspections at gas stations, saving one annual inspection visit.

County Personnel assists Procter and Gamble in acquiring funding from the State Employment Training Panel, to re-train employees to accommodate their plant expansion.

The Board of Supervisors acted to designate Ronald W. Komers, Personnel Director, as the Administrative Service Provider to the State Employment Training Panel, to assist Ventura county businesses in accessing funds for training programs targeting new and existing employees.

County's Resource Management Agency sponsors three employee "Attitude" workshops, focusing on the government/business partnership.

The Council endorsed sending a letter to our Congressional representatives regarding the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Municipal Stormwater Discharge. The regulation presents an economic burden for municipalities to implement the proposed program. The letter request reconsideration under amendments to the Clean Water Act, to remove municipal stormwater discharges from coverage, unless Congress appropriates funds to local government to cover all or the majority of the cost. Request for similar letters to be sent by City Managers.

County Resource Management Agency establishes "Quality Work Groups" to streamline procedures within the agency and inter-agency, such as between Planning/Zoning and Public Works.

Board of Supervisors approve streamlining of the Environmental Report Review Committee to make some land use applications ministerial, under the Planning Directors' approval.



Board of Supervisors approve an affordable housing project in Piru that will include 113 single-family units detached, along with 35 low income family apartments. Success of the project noted in the approximate 9-month "fast track" processing time, with no public opposition to the project.

The Council endorses a letter to the Board of Supervisors supporting a coalition of cities/business/government to participate in a grant application to the Federal Economic Development Administration. The planning grant could fund a market-feasibility study, economic analysis, definition of development goals, definition of project opportunities, and the formulation and implementation of a development plan.

Simi Valley establishes "Other Side of the Counter" program to provide attitude training for city employees.

Simi Valley City Council approved an automatic one-year extension to all building permits, because of the poor economy.

City of Moorpark approved rezoning of property to "commercial" to accommodate a proposed outlet mall.

Camarillo Chamber of Commerce receives a \$15,000 Economic Development Grant from GTE. In partnership with Oxnard College and the Oxnard Chamber, the consortium will look to develop strategies to improve business retention, attract new business, with emphasis on minority and women-owned business.

Simi Valley City Council acted to defer fees for business expansion, such as water/sanitation fees, until the Certificate of Occupancy is issued.

City of Port Hueneme sponsors "attitude" workshops for their employees.

City of Simi Valley establishes a Small Business Office in the Environmental Services Department, to assist small business through the permit process.

City of Camarillo establishes "Fast Track" and "Expedited Plan Check" programs in Building and Safety/Planning departments.

City of Camarillo and the Camarillo Chamber of Commerce establish an Economic Development Outreach committee to meet with existing businesses to offer assistance, troubleshoot areas, and to review ways and opportunities to attract new businesses.

City of Santa Paula initiated a citywide training program relating to customer service, employee attitude and making City Hall a more user friendly place.

City of Santa Paula City Council formed an eight member Citizens Ad Hoc Committee relating to customer services.

City of Oxnard established an Economic Development Department to give greater emphasis to the city's economic development efforts.

City of Oxnard established a new department of Development Services, a "One-Stop Center" designed to handle all permit processing in one location with the city organization.

City of Oxnard worked closely with Procter & Gamble Company to fast-track a \$150-million plan expansion, which matched the company's desired time frame.

City of Oxnard fast-tracked approval and permit processing for a new auto preparation facility for the Wallenium Lines. Produced a new industrial plant in Oxnard and cemented a strong customer for the Port of Hueneme.

City of Oxnard approved two regional retail projects, a Wal-Mart and Sam's Club center and a factory outlet center, which will produce a combined net new sales tax revenue of \$2.5 million annually, when in full operation, and produce 1500 new jobs.

City of Ventura committed to Valley Economic Development Center, a non-profit corporation, \$25,000 from its Community Development Block Grant Program, to match a \$25,000 SBA grant secured by VEDC. VEDC is providing technical assistance and business management advice to 100 Ventura businesses.

City of Ventura has waived until June 30, 1993, 18 different planning fees for non-residential uses who re-occupy existing vacant space and waived nine planning fees for non-residential uses who propose to expand or remodel at their current location.

City of Thousand Oaks has maintained the business license fee schedule established in 1970, as part of a business friendly attitude.

City of Thousand Oaks established a Blue Ribbon Economic Development Committee composed of business leaders from throughout the community to discuss economic development activities.

City of Thousand Oaks conducts weekly meetings with one of the city's major employers to discuss expansion/development issues.

City of Thousand Oaks established a fast-track processing, featuring simultaneous permit review and other time saving features, for major companies and industrial development applications.

City of Thousand Oaks established an Ombudsman program in the Planning Department to assist businesses with inter-department coordination.

City of Thousand Oaks approved an amendment to the MGG/Shapell Specific Plan to accommodate a major pharmaceutical facility.



## CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON COMPETITIVENESS

Our Council on Economic Vitality reviewed the report of the California Council on Competitiveness (the Ueberroth report). Our local assessment echoes its observations of the impediments to economic vitality, and we endorse its recommendations.

We believe it is more important, at this time, to generate constructive discussion of the full range of competitiveness issues raised by the report than to prematurely focus the discussion on a few issues.

We urge the Board of Supervisors and the City Councils to call upon the Governor and the Legislature to take up meaningful discussion of the full agenda of reform and rejuvenation set out in the Ueberroth report. As their discussion leads to specific proposals, our Council will discuss them and make appropriate recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

## CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON PARTNERSHIPS

Our Council on Economic Vitality received a verbal presentation of the findings of the California Council on Partnerships and subsequently reviewed its written report.

We are gratified to note that the formation of our Council and its agenda during the past year, closely mirrors the prescription for local partnerships spelled out in the C.C.O.P. report.

As the dissemination of the C.C.O.P. report leads to the formation of additional partnerships in other counties, we hope to participate in an exchange of constructive solutions to the common issues of economic vitality.

# THE FUTURE OF THE

## COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC VITALITY

1. The unique value of the Council is its role in bringing government and the private sector together for high level discussion of issues affecting our local economy.
2. The Council should continue to serve at the pleasure of the Board of Supervisors. Members will be appointed for one year at a time. It is expected that the Board will provide for continuity by reappointing some members each year.
3. Membership should be limited to 40, including 5 Supervisors, 10 Mayors (or their elected designee), 3 private sector appointees by each Supervisor, and 10 representatives of major countywide public and private sector constituencies. Members must commit to attend all meetings.
4. The Council will set its own agenda, appoint Task Forces as needed, and meet at least quarterly and as called by the Chair of the Council, or by the Chair of the Board of Supervisors.
5. Task Forces should be chaired by Council members and may include other Council members at their option, but would generally draw heavily from outside the Council for membership.
6. One meeting at the end of each year should be designated as an annual meeting to accept the reports of work completed in the prior year and to recommend a focused agenda for the following year. Each year's agenda should follow from the work of the prior year and strive toward actionable recommendations.
7. As recommendations are developed, the Council should assume the role of legislative advocate at the city, county, or state level as necessary to assure implementation of the recommendations.
8. An annual Economic Vitality Summit should follow soon after each annual meeting to communicate the Council's accomplishments to county and state leaders, including reports from Task Forces, acknowledgement of examples of progress, and examples of businesses retained or attracted.



# COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC VITALITY

## 1992 MEMBERS

### Ventura County Board of Supervisors, Ex Officio Members

Supervisor Maggie Kildee, Ventura County  
Supervisor Susan Lacey, Ventura County  
Supervisor Vicky Howard, Ventura County  
Supervisor Maria VanderKolk, Ventura County  
Supervisor John Flynn, Ventura County

### Ventura County Mayors

Mayor Stanley Daily, City of Camarillo  
Mayor Michael McMahan, City of Fillmore  
Mayor Paul Lawrason Jr., City of Moorpark  
Mayor James Loebel, City of Ojai  
Mayor Nao Takasugi, City of Oxnard  
Mayor Orvene Carpenter, City of Port Hueneme  
Mayor Greg Carson, City of San Buenaventura  
Mayor Alfonso Urias, City of Santa Paula  
Mayor Gregory Stratton, City of Simi Valley  
Mayor Robert Lewis, City of Thousand Oaks

### Association of Ventura County Cities (AVCC)

Councilmember David Smith, City of Camarillo  
Councilmember James Daniels, City of Port Hueneme  
Councilmember Judy Mikels, City of Simi Valley  
Councilmember Michael Piper, City of Simi Valley

### Business Members - Board Appointed

CEV Chairman, Marshall Milligan, Bank of A. Levy  
Nancy Bender, Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce  
Vince Barrons, Downtown Merchants Association  
Richard Bromser, IBEW 952  
Fred Buenger, Channel Islands Harbor Lessees Association  
Evie Bystrom-Herrera, Camarillo Chamber of Commerce  
Sue Chadwick, Bank of A. Levy  
Tila Estrada, Channel 57  
Al Guilin, Limoneira  
Andres Herrera, HAV & Associates  
Carl Huntsinger, General Partner, D.A.E.  
Carol Hunt, Moorpark Chamber of Commerce  
Klara Katersky, Katersky Mortgage Group  
Ian Kirkpatrick, Oxnard High School District  
Fred Kavli, Kavlico Corporation  
Wayne Lee, Simi Valley Enterprise





C124915805

Business Members - Board Appointed

Robert Lees, Pacific Intertrade Corporation  
Carolyn Leavens, Ventura County Farm Bureau  
Ralph Mahan, Mahan Development Corporation  
Steve Maulhardt, Maulhardt Industrial  
William McAleer, Ventura County National Bank  
Dr. William Mow, Bugle Boy Industries  
Bob Paulger, Procter & Gamble  
Steve Rubenstein, Thousand Oaks Chamber of Commerce  
Walt Schaedle, Conejo Courier & Cartage  
Mel Sheeler, First National Bank  
Gary Tuttle, Inside Track  
Anthony Taormina, Oxnard Harbor District  
Dana Weber Young, Ventura County Economic Development Association  
Lance Winslow, Car Wash Guys  
Marilyn Woods, KBBY